SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK COUNTY OF NASSAU

Luxottica of America, Inc.

Plaintiff.

Date Purchased: INDEX NO.

-against -

SUMMONS Plaintiff's Address: 12 Harbor Park Drive Port Washington, NY 11050 The basis of venue is: CPLR § 503(a)

View West Optical Inc., Dr. Larisa Ginzburg, Vint & York Inc.

Defendants

TO THE ABOVE NAMED DEFENDANT(S):

YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED to answer the complaint in this action and to serve a copy of your answer on the Plaintiff's Attorney(s) within 20 days after the serve of this summons, exclusive of the day of service for within 30 days after service is complete if this summons is not personally delivered to you within the State of New York; and in the case of your failure to appear or answer, judgment will be taken against you by default for the relief demanded in the complaint.

DATED: New York, New York May 22, 2019

/s/ John Manfredi

John Manfredi, Esq. Manfredi Law Group, PLLC ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF 302 East 19th St. Suite 2A New York, New York 10003 ph: (347) 614 7006

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK COUNTY OF NASSAU

INDEX NO.

Luxottica of America, Inc.

1)	lain	4.++	
_	инн		
	ши	u_{11}	٠

-against-

VERIFIED COMPLAINT

View West Optical Inc., Dr. Larisa Ginzburg, Vint & York Inc.

	fend	
DV.	LOTTO	ıuıı

Plaintiff, by its attorney, Manfredi Law Group, PLLC as and for its complaint, against the Defendants, allege as follows:

- 1. That at all times hereinafter mentioned, the Plaintiff is a New York corporation with offices at 12 Harbor Park Drive, Port Washington, New York 11050.
- 2. That at all times hereinafter mentioned, Defendant View West Optical Inc. is a New York corporation with offices at 72 Atlantic Ave, Lynbrook, New York
- 3. That at all times hereinafter mentioned, Vint & York Inc. is a New York corporation with offices at 247 Elizabeth Street, New York, NY 10012.
- 4. That upon information and belief, the Defendant, Dr. Larisa Ginzburg has offices at 247 Elizabeth Street, New York, NY 10012.
- 5. Upon information and belief, Dr. Larisa Ginzburg is the principal and owner of View West Optical Inc. and of Vint & York Inc.
- 6. This action is commenced in the County of Nassau because the Plaintiff and Defendant have offices in Nassau County.

FACTS

- 7. Plaintiff filed this action for recovery monies due based on the nonpayment for goods sold and delivered.
- 8. Plaintiff is a wholesale manufacturer and distributor of eye glass frames.
- 9. Defendants View West Optical Inc. of Vint & York Inc. are retail stores that that are in the business of selling eye glasses.
- 10. Between 6/13/2017 and 2/28/18, Defendants placed orders with Plaintiff for purchase and delivery of eye glass frames.

- 11. That from August through November, 2017 Plaintiff delivered to Defendant successive shipments of eyeglass frames with invoices.
- 12. The invoices are attached as Exhibit A.
- 13. Defendants confirmed receipt of the shipments and did not object to the invoices.
- 14. Defendants did not return any of the shipments.
- 15. Upon information and belief, Defendants resold the eye glass frames.
- 16. The repayment terms have not been modified, whether written or oral.
- 17. The Defendants accepted the eye glass frames but failed to pay the purchase price.
- 18. Vint & York Inc. is included in this lawsuit as the successor in interest and alter ego to View West Optical, Inc.
- 19. Upon information and belief, Vint & York Inc. resold the eye glass frames and benefitted from the goods received from the Plaintiff.
- 20. Dr. Larisa Ginzburg, in her personal capacity, benefited from the sale of goods from the Plaintiff.
- 21. That the Plaintiff relief upon the representations and orders placed by Dr. Larisa Ginzburg.
- 22. Dr. Larisa Ginzburg, in her personal capacity, benefited from the sale of goods from the Plaintiff.
- 23. The Defendants' accepted and failed to return the eye glass frames to the Plaintiff.
- 24. The unpaid balance of the shipped eye glass frames is \$87,312.12 together with pre-judgment interest.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(breach of contract)

- 25. Plaintiff repeats, reiterates, and re-alleges each and every allegation contained in paragraphs "1" through "24" with the same force and effect.
- 26. Plaintiff performed all obligations under the agreement to ship eye glass frames to the Defendant.
- 27. Defendant View West Optical Inc. breached the agreement by failing to pay the purchase price.
- 28. By reason of the foregoing, the Defendant View West Optical Inc. is liable to the Plaintiff for the sum of \$87,312.12 plus pre-judgment interest.
- 29. "Under New York law, 'a plaintiff who prevails on a claim for breach of contract is entitled to prejudgment interest as a matter of right.' <u>U.S. Naval Inst. v. Charter Commc'ns, Inc.</u>, 936 F.2d 692, 698 (2d Cir.1991) (citing N.Y. C.P.L.R. §§ 5001, 5002). Section 5001(a) of the New York Civil Practice Law and Rules provides, in relevant part, that "[i]nterest shall be computed from the earliest ascertainable date the cause of action existed[.]" CPLR § 5001(b). In New York, the statutory rate for prejudgment interest in a breach of contract action is nine percent per year. N.Y. C.P.L.R. §

- 5004; Marfia v. T.C. Ziraat Bankasi, 147 F.3d 83, 90 (2d Cir.1998). Quincy Mut. Fire Ins. Co. v New York Cent. Mut. Fire Ins. Co., 89 F Supp 3d 291, 313 [NDNY 2014].
- 30. Accordingly, Plaintiff is entitled to accrued prejudgment interest, calculated at 9.0% per annum from the date of the last unpaid invoice.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(unjust enrichment)

- 31. Plaintiff repeats, reiterates, and re-alleges each and every allegation contained in paragraphs "1" through "30" with the same force and effect.
- 32. Defendants have been unjustly enriched for the sum of goods delivered to the Defendants.
- 33. By reason of the foregoing, the Defendants' are liable to the Plaintiff for the sum of \$87,312.12;

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(account stated)

- 34. Plaintiff repeats, reiterates, and re-alleges each and every allegation contained in paragraphs "1" through "33" with the same force and effect.
- 35. The Invoices were sent to the Defendant.
- 36. Defendant View West Optical Inc. did not object to the invoices.
- 37. As a result of the foregoing, the Defendants are indebted to the Defendant View West Optical Inc. in the sum of \$87,312.12;

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Quantum Valebant)

- 38. Plaintiff repeats, reiterates, and re-alleges each and every allegation contained in paragraphs "1" through "37" with the same force and effect.
- 39. The reasonable value of the goods is \$87,312.12.
- 40. Defendants accepted delivery and retained benefits of the Plaintiff's good without objection, leaving a full balance of \$87,312.12.
- 41. Upon information and belief, each of the Defendants beneffited from the value of goods shipped by the Plaintiff.
- 42. Defendants are indebted to the Defendants in Quantum Valebant in the sum of \$87,312.12;

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(goods sold and delivered)

43. Plaintiff repeats, reiterates, and re-alleges each and every allegation contained in paragraphs "1" through "42" with the same force and effect.

- 44. The Defendant bought goods from the Plaintiff and must pay the contract price of the goods it accepted. U.C.C.§2-607(1). U.C.C. § 2-607(1) requires the buyer to pay the contract rate for any goods accepted; unless, pursuant to U.C.C. § 2-607(3)(a), the buyer notifies the seller of a breach within a reasonable time after he discovers or should have discovered any breach.
- 45. U.C.C. § 2-607(4) places the burden on the buyer to establish any breach with respect to goods accepted.
- 46. UCC § 2-607 states:
 - 1. The buyer must pay at the contract rate for any goods accepted.
 - 2. Acceptance of goods by the buyer precludes rejection of the goods accepted and if made with knowledge of a non-conformity cannot be revoked because of it unless the acceptance was on the reasonable assumption that the non-conformity would be seasonably cured but acceptance does not of itself impair any other remedy provided by this Article for non-conformity.
 - 3. Where a tender has been accepted
 - 1 the buyer must within a reasonable time after he discovers or should have discovered any breach notify the seller of breach or be barred from any remedy; and
 - 2 if the claim is one for infringement or the like (subsection (3) of Section 2-312) and the buyer is sued as a result of such a breach he must so notify the seller within a reasonable time after he receives notice of the litigation or be barred from any remedy over for liability established by the litigation.
 - 4. The burden is on the buyer to establish any breach with respect to the goods accepted.
- 47. Under subsection (1), the Official Comment states that once the buyer accepts a tender the seller acquires a right to its price on the contract terms. (Official Comment, McKinney's UCC § 2-607).
- 48. Here, the Defendants accepted the goods delivered by the Plaintiff and made no written, oral, or obvious objections to the goods received.
- 49. Therefore, the Plaintiff is entitled to the contract price.
- 50. Once goods are accepted, a buyer may revoke such an acceptance pursuant to UCC § 2-608.
- 51. UCC § 2-608. Revocation of Acceptance in Whole or in Part
 - 1. The buyer may revoke his acceptance of a lot or commercial unit whose nonconformity substantially impairs its value to him if he has accepted it

- 1. on the reasonable assumption that its non-conformity would be cured and it has not been seasonably cured; or
- 2. without discovery of such non-conformity if his acceptance was reasonably induced either by the difficulty of discovery before acceptance or by the seller's assurances.
- 2. Revocation of acceptance must occur within a reasonable time after the buyer discovers or should have discovered the ground for it and before any substantial change in condition of the goods which is not caused by their own defects. It is not effective until the buyer notifies the seller of it.
- 3. A buyer who so revokes has the same rights and duties with regard to the goods involved as if he had rejected them.
- 52. The Defendants actions have not conformed to any of the exceptions set forth in the preceding passage.
- 53. The Defendants did not revoke acceptance of the goods within a reasonable time after accepting the goods, via written, oral, or other manifest communication.
- 54. At no time have the defendants made reference to the quality or condition of the goods received.
- 55. Plaintiff respectfully requests a judgment against View West Optical Inc. for the sum of \$87,312.12 plus pre-judgment interest accruing at 9.0% per annum;

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(fraud)

- 56. Plaintiff repeats, reiterates, and re-alleges each and every allegation contained in paragraphs "1" through "55" with the same force and effect.
- 57. Upon information and belief, Dr. Larisa Ginzburg is the principal and owner of View West Optical Inc. of Vint & York Inc.
- 58. That the individual defendant Dr. Larisa Ginzburg benefitted in her personal capacity from the shipments attached as Exhibit A.
- 59. The elements of a cause of action for fraud are representation of a material fact, falsity, scienter, reasonable reliance and injury.
- 60. The Defendant Dr. Larisa Ginzburg placed the orders for her corporation View West Optical, Inc., was entrusted to receive and pay for the sum of goods delivered to her corporation.
- 61. That the Defendant Dr. Larisa Ginzburg intended to deceive the Plaintiff, because the goods were promised to be paid for, the goods delivered were used by an alternate corporation, and the Plaintiff relied upon the representations made by Dr. Larisa Ginzburg.
- 62. That the aforementioned fraud alleged is collateral to the contractual obligation.

- 63. The Plaintiff relied on the Defendant Dr. Larisa Ginzburg to make payments honestly through one corporation, based on the duration of the shipments to that corporation, and that reliance caused significant monetary loss and damages to the Plaintiff.
- 64. Dr. Larisa Ginzburg assumed control over the Plaintiff's product through use of an alternate corporation.
- 65. Plaintiff is entitled to actual damages and all "consequential damages naturally flowing from a fraud" to the extent required "to restore a party to the position occupied before commission of the fraud." Alpert v. Shea Gould Climenko & Casey, 160 A.D.2d 67 (1st Dep't 1990).
- 66. Plaintiff respectfully requests a judgment against Larisa Ginzburg for the sum of \$87,312.12 together with consequential damages.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(successor liability)

- 67. Plaintiff repeats, reiterates, and re-alleges each and every allegation contained in paragraphs "1" through "66" with the same force and effect.
- 68. Upon information and belief, Vint and York, Inc. is included in this lawsuit as successor to View West Optical Inc.
- 69. Upon information and belief, Vint and York, Inc. is a continuation of View West Optical Inc.
- 70. Upon information and belief, Vint and York, Inc. is the same business operation as View West Optical Inc.
- 71. Upon information and belief, Vint and York, Inc. and View West Optical Inc. have the same owner.
- 72. Upon information and belief, Vint and York, Inc. benefited from the shipments attached as Exhibit A.
- 73. Plaintiff respectfully requests a judgment against Vint and York, Inc. for the sum of \$87,312.12.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff demands the entry of a Judgment against the Defendants as follows:

- 74. On the First Cause of Action against the Defendant View West Optical Inc. for the sum of \$87312.12 plus pre-judgment interest accruing at 9.0% per annum;
- 75. On the Second Cause of Action against the Defendant View West Optical Inc. for the sum of \$87,312.12;
- 76. On the Third Cause of Action against the Defendant View West Optical Inc. for the sum of \$87,312.12;
- 77. On the Fourth Cause of Action against the Defendants for the sum of \$87,312.12;

- 78. On the Fifth Cause of Action against the Defendant View West Optical Inc. for the sum of \$87,312.12 plus pre-judgment interest accruing at 9.0% per annum;
- 79. On the Sixth Cause of Action against the Defendant Larisa Ginzburg for the sum of \$87,312.12 together with consequential damages;
- 80. On the Seventh Cause of Action against the Defendant Vint and York, Inc. for the sum of \$87,312.12;
- 81. Granting the Plaintiff costs and disbursements of this action;
- 82. Granting the Plaintiff such other, further, and different relief as this Court deems just and proper.

<u>VERIFICATION</u>: The undersigned, affirms under penalties of perjury, that he is a member of the firm appearing as attorney of record for the Plaintiff, has read this complaint and knows its contents, and that the same is alleged upon information and belief and believes it to be true. Affirmant states that the grounds of his belief is correspondence furnished to him by the Plaintiff and interviews with officers of the Plaintiff. This verification is made by Affirmant because Plaintiff's place of business is located outside the County where Affirmant maintains his law practice and the plaintiff has authorized me to make said Verification on its behalf. This verification is affirmed on May 10, 2019.

DATED: New York, New York May 21, 2019

/s/ John Manfredi

John Manfredi, Esq. Manfredi Law Group, PLLC ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF 302 East 19th St. Suite 2A New York, New York 10003 ph: (347) 614 7006

INDEX NO.	
SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK	
COUNTY OF NASSAU	
Luxottica of America, Inc.	
Plaintiff Plaintiff	
-against-	
View West Optical Inc., et al.	
view west Optical life., et al.	
Defendant(s)	
SUMMONS AND VERIFIED COMPLAINT	
Signature (Rule 130-1.1-a)	
/s/ John S Manfredi	
John S Manfredi	
John 5 Wanned	
Manfredi Law Group, PLLC Attorney for Plaintiff	
302 East 19 th St. Suite 2A	
New York, New York 10003	
Phone (347) 614 7006	
Fax (347) 332 1740	
Service of a copy of the within is hereby admitted. Dated,	
Attorney(s) for	
Sir: Please take notice	
NOTICE OF ENTRY	
NOTICE OF ENTRY	
That the within is a (certified) true copy of a duly entered in the office of the clerk of the within named court or	ı
NOTICE OF SETTLEMENT	
That an order of which the within is a true copy of a Settlement to the HON. presented for o the judges	ne of
Of the within named Court, at On the day of2019 atAM Dated,	

Exhibit A

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

CERTIFICATE OF INDEBTEDNESS

STEPHEN DIDOVICH 1620 E 2ND ST APT 6A BROOKLYN, NY 11230 Account No. XXXXX6756

I certify that U.S. Department of Education records show that the BORROWER named above is indebted to the United States in the amount stated below plus additional interest from 04/19/19.

On or about 10/30/06, the BORROWER executed a promissory note to secure a Federal Family Education Loan Program Consolidation loan from CHASE USA/SALLIE MAE. The loan was disbursed for \$15,366.30 on 11/24/06 at 7.25% interest per annum. The loan obligation was guaranteed by AMERICAN STUDENT ASSISTANCE, and then reinsured by the Department of Education under loan guaranty programs authorized under Title IV-B of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, 20 U.S.C. 1071 et seq. (34 C.F.R. Part 682). The holder demanded payment according to the terms of the note, and credited \$14,905.31 to the outstanding principal owed on the loan. The BORROWER defaulted on the obligation on 03/23/08, and the holder filed a claim on the loan guarantee.

Due to this default, the guaranty agency paid a claim in the amount of \$16,852.73 to the holder. The guarantor was then reimbursed for that claim payment by the Department under its reinsurance agreement. Pursuant to 34 C.F.R. § 682.410(b)(4), once the guarantor pays on a default claim, the entire amount paid becomes due to the guarantor as principal. The guarantor attempted to collect this debt from the BORROWER. The guarantor was unable to collect the full amount due, and on 10/16/13, assigned its rights and title to the loan to the Department.

Since assignment of the loan, the Department has credited a total of \$0.00 in payments from all sources, including Treasury Department offsets, if any, to the balance. After application of these payments, the BORROWER now owes the United States the following:

Principal: \$16.852.73

Interest: \$13.508.97

Total debt as of 04/19/19: \$30,361.70

Interest accrues on the principal shown here at the rate of \$3.35 per day.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746(2), I certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on: 4/19/19

Loan Analyst
Litigation Support Unit

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

f	or the
Dis	strict of
Plaintiff(s) V. Defendant(s))))) (Civil Action No.)))))
SUMMONS IN	A CIVIL ACTION
To: (Defendant's name and address)	
A lawsuit has been filed against you.	
are the United States or a United States agency, or an offic	ou (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you eer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. swer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of on must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney,
If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be You also must file your answer or motion with the court.	entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. DOUGLAS C. PALMER CLERK OF COURT
Date:	Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

Civil Action No.

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (l))

was re	This summons for (nate)	me of individual and title, if any)			
	•	I the summons on the individual	l at (place)		
			on (date)	; or	
	☐ I left the summons	at the individual's residence or	usual place of abode with (name)		
		, a pers	on of suitable age and discretion who re	sides the	æ,
	on (date)	, and mailed a copy to	the individual's last known address; or		
	☐ I served the summe	ons on (name of individual)			, who is
	designated by law to	accept service of process on bel	half of (name of organization)		
			on (date)	; or	
	☐ I returned the sum	mons unexecuted because			; or
	☐ Other (specify):				
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$		
	I declare under penalt	y of perjury that this informatio	on is true.		
Date:					
Date.			Server's signature		
			Printed name and title		
			Server's address		

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS United States of America			DEFENDANTS Stephen Didovich		
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, John Manfredi Law Group, P 302 East 19th Street, Sui	XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA Address, and Telephone Numbe LLC	r)	NOTE: IN LAND CONI THE TRACT Attorneys (If Known)	of First Listed Defendant <u>k</u> (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES O DEMNATION CASES, USE THE OF LAND INVOLVED.	/
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in C	One Box Only)	 I. CITIZENSHIP OF PI	RINCIPAL PARTIES	Place an "X" in One Box for Plainti,
X 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government)		(For Diversity Cases Only) PT Citizen of This State	TF DEF	and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF cipal Place ' 4 ' 4
2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenshi)	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State	of Business In A	Another State
			Citizen or Subject of a ' Foreign Country	3 ' 3 Foreign Nation	' 6 ' 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		ely) ORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement ofJudgment □ 151 Medicare Act X 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury- Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities- Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities- Other 448 Education	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITIONS Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General	Gestivation of Property 21 USC 881 Gestivation of Property 21 USC 881 LABOR	' 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 ' 423 Withdrawal	' 375 False Claims Act ' 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) ' 400 State Reapportionment ' 410 Antitrust ' 430 Banks and Banking ' 450 Commerce ' 460 Deportation ' 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations ' 480 Consumer Credit ' 490 Cable/Sat TV ' 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange ' 890 Other Statutory Actions ' 891 Agricultural Acts ' 893 Environmental Matters ' 895 Freedom of Information Act ' 896 Arbitration ' 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision ' 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
Proceeding Sta VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	oved from a 3 Reference te Court	Appellate Court IS A CLASS ACTION	Reinstated or Reopened 5 Transfer Another (specify) DEMAND \$30,361.70	r District Litigation	if demanded in complaint: No
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE June 1, 2019	,	SIGNATURE OF ATTOR	RNEY OF RECORD /s/ John M	lanfredi	
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY					

JUDGE ____

MAG. JUDGE

RECEIPT # _____ AMOUNT ____ APPLYING IFP

CERTIFICATION OF ARBITRATION ELIGIBILITY

Local Arbitration Rule 83.7 provides that with certain exceptions, actions seeking money damages only in an amount not in excess of \$150,000, exclusive of interest and costs, are eligible for compulsory arbitration. The amount of damages is presumed to be below the threshold amount unless a certification to the contrary is filed.

certificatio	ion to the contrary is med.	
Case is El	ligible for Arbitration X	
I,	, counsel for	, do hereby certify that the above captioned civil action is ineligible for
	<u> </u>	000 evaluative of intersect and costs
	monetary damages sought are in excess of \$150, the complaint seeks injunctive relief,	ood, exclusive of interest and costs,
	the matter is otherwise ineligible for the following in	reason
	DISCLOSURE STATEMENT -	FEDERAL RULES CIVIL PROCEDURE 7.1
	Identify any parent corporation and any p	publicly held corporation that owns 10% or more or its stocks:
	RELATED CASE STATEME	NT (Section VIII on the Front of this Form)
to another substantial deemed "re "Presumpt"	r civil case for purposes of this guideline when, because of the similarit al saving of judicial resources is likely to result from assigning both case related" to another civil case merely because the civil case: (A) involve	ule 50.3.1 in Section VIII on the front of this form. Rule 50.3.1 (a) provides that "A civil case is "related" y of facts and legal issues or because the cases arise from the same transactions or events, a es to the same judge and magistrate judge." Rule 50.3.1 (b) provides that "A civil case shall not be s identical legal issues, or (B) involves the same parties." Rule 50.3.1 (c) further provides that uant to paragraph (d), civil cases shall not be deemed to be "related" unless both cases are still
	NY-E DIVISION	OF BUSINESS RULE 50.1(d)(2)
1.)	Is the civil action being filed in the Eastern Distriction County?	ct removed from a New York State Court located in Nassau or Suffolk
2.)	If you answered "no" above: a) Did the events or omissions giving rise to the County?	claim or claims, or a substantial part thereof, occur in Nassau or Suffolk
	b) Did the events or omissions giving rise to the District?	claim or claims, or a substantial part thereof, occur in the Eastern
	c) If this is a Fair Debt Collection Practice Act case, received:	specify the County in which the offending communication was
Suffolk (answer to question 2 (b) is "No," does the defendant (or County, or, in an interpleader action, does the claimant County?	a majority of the defendants, if there is more than one) reside in Nassau or (or a majority of the claimants, if there is more than one) reside in Nassau or
Sulloik		f the County in which it has the most significant contacts).
		BAR ADMISSION
	I am currently admitted in the Eastern District of New	York and currently a member in good standing of the bar of this court.
		Yes
	Are you currently the subject of any disciplinary	action (s) in this or any other state or federal court?
		No
	I certify the accuracy of all information provided	

Print Save As... Reset Last Modified: 11/27/2017

Signature: /s/ John Manfredi